## REMARKS

The Official Action dated November 27, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and the foregoing amendment has been made in response thereto. Claims 1, 14-16, 18, 20-22 and 24-26 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Register et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,371,807) and Kesel (U.S. Patent No. 6,026,387). Claims 2-7, 12, 13, 23, 27, and 28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Register et al. and Kesel in view of Kriens et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,864.862). Claims 8-9 and 29-32 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Register et al. and Kesel in view of Kriens et al. and further in view of Trout (U.S. Patent No. 5,566,349). Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Register et al. and Kesel in view of Kriens et al. and further in view of Bossemeyer, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,510,427). Claim 17 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Register et al. and Kesel in view of Chase (U.S. Patent No. 6,332,143).

Rejection of claims 1-18 and 20-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103 (a)

The rejections of claims 1-18 and 19-32 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) are respectfully traversed. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, at least the following requirements must be met: (1) the references when combined must teach or suggest all elements of the claimed subject matter; (2) there must be some motivation, suggestion or teaching to combine the references; and (3) there must be, within the references, a reasonable expectation of success. *See* M.P.E.P. § 2143 (8th ed., Rev. 2), at 2100-129. The Office has not established a *prima facie* case of obviousness because these requirements have not been satisfied. The cited references do not teach or suggest all elements of the claimed subject matter.

Independent claim 1, as amended, recites a method executable by an automated system without requiring intervention by a human user, comprising:

associating values with a plurality of predefined words;

receiving customer feedback in the form of textual comments that originate with a human customer of an enterprise;

comparing words in the customer feedback with said predefined words;

generating an indication to rate said customer feedback based on an identification of at least one word in said customer feedback as equivalent to one of said predefined words and the value of said equivalent one of said predefined words; and

presenting said indication to a customer representative for said enterprise.

Column 5, lines 38-50 of Register et al. was cited as teaching the step of "associating values with a plurality of predefined words." Column 2, lines 35-40, and column 5, lines 34-50 of Register et al. were cited as teaching the step of "comparing words in the customer feedback with said predefined words." Column 5, lines 48-62 of Register et al. was cited as teaching the step of "generating an indication to rate said customer feedback based on an identification of at least one word in said customer feedback as equivalent to one of said predefined words and the value of said equivalent one of said predefined words."

Column 1, lines 9-11, and Figure 3 of Kesel were cited as teaching the step of "receiving customer feedback in the form of textual comments that originate with a human customer of an enterprise."

It is not seen that Register et al., Kesel, or any of the other cited references teach or suggest, singularly or in combination, the steps of "associating values with a plurality of predefined words" or "generating an indication to rate said customer feedback based on an identification of at least one word in said customer

feedback as equivalent to one of said predefined words and the value of said equivalent one of said predefined words." Column 5, lines 34 through 61 of Register et al., which was cited as teaching these limitations, is provided below:

> The list of recognized keywords extracted from the input text passed to the similarity measuring module 36 is used to calculate a numeric similarity score for each predefined category. Each score indicates how similar a given category is to the input text. The similarity measuring module 36 uses a knowledge base of keyword/-category profiles 56 to determine the similarity score. Each category in the knowledge base of keyword/category profiles 56 has an associated profile. The profile tells the similarity measuring module 36 which keywords provide evidence for the given category. Associated with each keyword in a profile is a numeric weight called a "profile weight" that tells the similarity measureing module 36 the amount of evidence a keyword provides for the given category. The module 36 determines profile weights and combines the profile weights to arrive at similarity scores for all the categories. Once the similarity scores have been calculated, a dynamic threshold is applied to all of the categories defined in the domain specific knowledge base 20. Those categories whose similarity scores are below the threshold are discarded from consideration as being potentially most similar to the input text. The categories whose similarity scores are above the threshold are compiled into a list and are passed to the next module or directly to the external application 24 (not shown), along with the list of extracted keywords and the list of deduced facts, if there are any.

The excerpt from Register et al. provided above describes the operation of a portion of the text classification system illustrated in Figure 3. The system includes a similarity measuring module 36 that receives a list of recognized keywords and, utilizing a knowledge base of keyword/category profiles 56, calculates similarity scores for each predefined category. Associated with each keyword is a numeric weight, referred to as a "profile weight" that tells the similarity module the amount of evidence a keyword provides for a given category. It is not seen that the system described in Register et al. associates values with a plurality of predefined words. Neither the similarity scores nor profile weights discussed in Register et al. are believed to be equivalent to the values associated with predefined words recited in claim 1. Additionally, neither the similarity scores nor profile weights of Register et al. provides "an indication to rate said customer feedback based on an identification of at least one word in said customer feedback as equivalent to one of said predefined words *and the value of said equivalent one of said predefined words*."

It is accordingly believed that claim 1 recites an invention which is patentable over the cited references. As discussed above, it is not seen that Register et al., Kesel, or any of the other cited references teach or suggest, singularly or in combination, the steps of associating values with a plurality of predefined words; and generating an indication to rate said customer feedback based on an identification of at least one word in said customer feedback as equivalent to one of said predefined words and the value of said equivalent one of said predefined words.

Independent claims 14 and 25 each include limitations similar to those of claim 1, described above. Accordingly claims 14 and 25 are also believed patentable over the cited references. The remaining claims in the present

application depend from, and further limit the inventions recited in claims 1, 14 or 25, and are therefore also patentable over the cited references.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, it is believed that the application including claims 1-18 and 20-32 is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

James M. Stover
Reg. No. 32,759

Intellectual Property Section
Law Department
Teradata Corporation
2835 Miami Village Drive
Miamisburg, Ohio 45342

Tel. No. (937) 242-4727
Fax No. (937) 439-0693